

Finger, State Assembly, CA, 30 Sept 82

24 Sept 82

- New weapons are for... thinking... FU/FS
but ... the ^{cost} are more likely
[Hyp: morally
forbidden?] → - is at least some circumstances
- on balance
- and, if others, as well.
- Now, & urgency, to avoid - Reagan's (Carter) ^{FS} new weapons
- a new round:
 - "one new round" of new
- decade of prolif.
- One new experimental test of "bargaining chip"
thing, or thing of over-arming, outspending "
is justified; see past results, "costs."
- One new grasp for "the H-bomb Bomb that will
justify the whole arms race - and Hiroshima -
(+ Feller's Hell-bomb)" is not justified.

Katy (?) Ver. ... Could SC do it if in this intent?
(Could SC find it in this intent to stop - as part of
- opment - to help opment + disrupt it?)

Prop 1 calls for immediate, mutual, verifiable halt

~~That To oppose - aimed to be salient - is to support
the alternatives: the immediate + continuing, ^{with only two -} mutual,
all-too-unverifiable buildup on both sides of the
nuclear weapons, ^{Moreover, of which developed,} now being tested, produced + deployed:
increasingly accurate weapons whose prime function, as
addition to stockpiles, is to threaten or compel the
destruction of the opponent's main command centers +
^{land-based} missiles before those missiles are launched: i.e. they
are FS weapons. Moreover, many of these - like the
MX, P, ^{SS-18}, ~~SS-18~~, ~~SS-20~~, are themselves unharmable - so they
are lightning rods for attack in a crisis. This existence con-
tributes further or tempts the opponent to attack us
with our disarm weapons before they are destroyed.
They lower the meaning of both sides. [The current possession
of such weapons on both sides shows an ominous, comparable
universality of both: US MX Mk 124, + ASW, SS-18
To add now, still more accurate weapons, first on ^{Mod 4}
US side, the swing a SC, will make sit. for worse]~~

Why, really?


To someone who knows the largely secret history of
our past uses of nuclear weapons, the perceived
the reason this Admin feels a urgent need for these FS weapons
is clear. [Note contortions, trying to hide fact that MX is
a FS weapon.] R makes no secret that he believes US must
continue to rely on FC threats - despite SC ability to retaliate
in kind, or escalate. In NE, Europe, ...

~~Perhaps~~
Perhaps ^{even the} accelerated by abandonment of the single
real restraint we have negot: ABM treaty.

- May American may believe that the Pres' negot proposal
is an alternative path to the same goal as the Fringe,
- a halt to the arms race -
and maybe even goes beyond it, to ~~the~~ a reduction.
- They are misled.

- ~~The~~ The START proposal is not a way to end the ~~development~~
arms race; it is a way to continue the arms race, in its
most dangerous aspects.

- It does not propose to halt the testing, prod, disp of the
new FS or conceivable weapons on either side, ever.
Not only would both continue ... during long negot -
they would be allowed & encouraged to continue even if & after
a successful agreement had been reached on Pres' terms...

 - The immediate obstacle to the joint exploration of a possible
mutual halt is not SU resistance to the idea, nor SU resistance
to our verif. agreements. We have not proposed
any verif. agreements - ~~test this about~~....

It is Pres' refusal to propose to the Soviet Union a
goal, his refusal to begin the discussion of the criteria
for an immediate halt...

It is his determination to have these new weapons - ~~whether~~
or not and to reject any arrangement - on properly verifiable &
observed by SU - that would preclude on doing getting them.

→ Why? So one who knows... FU/FS.

- SU may have some notion: if agent is impossible, this... behavior like US, vs. non-rue efforts...

- A strong case can be made that the new weapons would lower our security - by tempting the US into threats that ought have to be carried out

- & by tempting SU to tempt in a crisis - even if SU did not respond to counter or match them.

- But I will focus on a much more likely prospect - that the alternative to a Frage is a mental buildup, & spec. that it makes highly likely ^{and} SU moves + weapons that reduce the security of both.

H/26W
Chenille

- Look at efforts on US of SS-18 ^{+ SS-20} accuracy! ^{that's only 1/4 of our weapons!}

- unmissable CM (MX?)

- ^{active} MX

- D-5

- LOW

- counsel. of ABM

- P

P, CM, D-5, MX

- Won't ~~expect~~ of these new deals have any effect, which

they threaten 3/4 of this - (in addition to our ASW that is this way?)

(Para 1 - Cf. always - all too certain... kind, neutral...
→ it seems to be ~~discussed~~.

START? ~~either~~ - alt. to build-up, better than a freeze? No.

To refuse to approve a total halt is to accept -- as SU build-up. & don't ^{until} want this

My desire ~~for~~ for an imad. halt does not reflect
on trust in the SU. ~~Wks~~

— Look at my record: 15 years as a CW...
it does not reflect such true spirit trusting Russians.

For have I heard anything since

— Afghan, Poland — that has changed of early understanding
aggressive ~~behaviour~~

of the or give me more trust.

How to live in this dangerous world? By continuing to avoid any attempt to
~~Mythology of~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~policy~~ ~~is not~~ ~~best~~ ~~and~~

stop SU?

— Those who find the present build-ups safer
than any possible more attempts to halt both build-ups
do not seem less trusting ^{than} of SU than I am —

in any way if we are trusting ^{of the SU}, in comparison, to the point
of recklessness.

— SU will simply give us more — less pressure.

— SU will ~~agreed~~ not count on new weapons:

COW, mobile, unmanipulable, big weapons, (ABM)

— give up = fear of technological ^(all now being the same) ~~sub.~~ ~~(look at US!)~~

— SU will not seek to imitate: will accept freeze after
we have built up.

I would wish in but

— I don't trust SU to do any of these...

— Probably RMR doesn't either: or opposing witnesses. They prob.
expect that if we build — — — — —, SU will not th...
... agree to freeze that...

~~Not to know, that is...~~

but I don't want them to have ... I don't trust them ^{with}...

Does R? Do witnesses? What is the proposal for stopping them? (START does not). R has not precluded any mech.

W/ the exception - the capturing, this exception as unavoidable without even trying to stop them?

"It doesn't matter how many what kind of weapons SO has - or how many we have the first, later."

There is a kind of trust behind this...

"SO rational, prudent, cautious, C-r, controlled, hierarchical, - it will always break down, reliably & in time - before superior technology, strength, will..."

^{under for this}
- don't ~~trust~~ - but to justify the refusal to explore the fringe path, to show on past & current course of events - is to not if one is center of this - and th are - which seems to be naive, romantic (technology, strength) ^{will} unrealistic -

We should not don't trust the docs, ^{to possess} with these weapons, never use them, prompt, COV, or US on low control. (to be so much easier than we!) & know this ^(Cuban) is wrong.

" I don't trust them to let us get any signif. superiority..."

" I don't trust ^{the power of} new gadgets (ABY...) that to be on shield of safety - and not that safe

- I don't trust them always to back down - even if ^{on how and U)}

- I don't trust the old policies - avoidance of restraints,

prevalence of superiority, one that is in the new world.

To preserve nostalgically the old superiority that is lost

forever, is not enough to waste $\frac{1}{2}$ trillion dollars, it is to minimize catastrophes. We must do better to protect children than our past policies

another
reason for
rejecting
(fringe):
FO [e.g.]
FS
sub.

It is ultimate reality to believe both sides can...
thinks

It is even the reality to believe wars or. SU can be limited,
or small wars can happen without...

We must explain also that. seek to not omit a bullet

...

This Press will not do that without public pressure.

This Committee can do more than ~~for~~

You can reach your own decision to join that pressure...

CD, ad

// "Are we willing to let the Russians reach
parity with us?"

We all agree that any nuclear war, & any big war,
WWI - 15M must be avoided ... if at all possible.
WWII 250

Nobody wants WWIII, no one in this room — and
nobody likes the
Balance of terror, or invention of Robert Strauss
McNamara (sic)

RR is the first Pres to have the courage to
say, "We are inferior." ... not a politically
advantageous statement to make.

[I would "give up" P/CM, etc. in order to
stop SU P/CM, etc.]

~~What~~ What would I tell him?

What would he "pay" to purchase SU P/CM?

~~For what reason~~ Anything — in the way
of UJ FS/CF cap?]

—Teller: If there were a nuclear war today,
SU would win it, and would win the world.

[WWII] will allow mankind to survive, with
certainty. [For his war, I cannot make the
same claim — "for certain self-multiplying
his organisms let loose on the world...]

Teller

[On Sov dissent - they don't allow even
independent pol. activity even if it supports
public + private SU aims!]

SU will win because: Civilian Defense

At least 90% of Sov citizens will survive
in US, less than 50% - because of
scandalous neglect. T finds this "credible."

[If you talk of beating SU CD (+ABM),
[even, with current
US weapons] so as to deter SU FS - would you decline?
Would you expect to fail?]

Teller has seen R for 23 minutes, since Pres.

Comments proposed

- not bigger nuclear weapon - our weapons are
big enough, and we have made the smaller.

[So - he explains this:]

"Sov striking power is at least 3 times that of US
We may need more retaliatory ^{weapons}, because MAD
is assumed only if Sovs still us.

I am not strongly ~~in~~ in favor.

Revised note by me, a woman-art, 74-year-old physicist.

Katz

No verification possible of his war (!) [2) ^{has} been "discovered" (if it has happened)
No reaction to Sunderland - no clues... - 3) Has not yet convinced public

"The Fringe cannot be verified."

but that doesn't determine USG reaction.

In 1961 - if we had not resumed testing, we would not have gotten treaty of 1961. (OB comes!)

[Fear of psych/pol effects on public → fear on USG → of seizing argument, of suggesting that "adequate" verification or treaty may be accessible.]

Main reason for opposing - Fringe precludes research pursuit of, and implicit claim of, superiority.]

What Katz is now saying is the safe, conventional wisdom - He may think he's still in the late '50's when "nobody" would believe him (and he was wrong!) "No one can make a career challenging conventional wisdom."

- [Opponents of Fringe are not arguing from ignorance - but from "knowledge"; ^{CA, not SU!} we have satellites, etc. This means hyper satellites - covered weakness! Yet they didn't speak.

My career

Real

I am not allowed to tell you what the
I won't break laws, because without laws a
Don't be satisfied society cannot survive.
with

Bohr, the greatest of the all.

There are nuclear weapons. A nuclear fringe will

~~strawed~~
Teller's expertise as an ^{strategic} analyst is ~~invaluable~~ could be
flattered by calling it "mediocre"; if he
believes that - 90% of laws would survive
- SU is superior

- "SU" would win and rule the world..."

Teller is unbalanced as a bomb designer and brilliant as a
lobbyist and opinion-maker, in certain circles -

(Schultz is a "travel atom-bomb dropper.")

How to
He is not an expert in ^{how to} improve his security ~~the high command~~ win
an arms race; an arms race is what we've had - perhaps
that's partly to Teller - and the world + US are not better for it.

1957-58

US citizens can choose: whether or not to believe ET that
there are imaging US drunk. that will be so wonderful in 10 years that
we

Q to Teller Since you feel we can't verify Frange, why
are you sure SV is superior?

- I'm not sure - but I think it's highly likely...

VCS have reason to deny it - but they are agonizing...

N-bomb "only $\frac{1}{2}$ mile lethality."

Teller on N-bomb: I favor a commitment by USG,

"No aggressive first-use of nuclear weapons by US -
but in defense of our allies (on their territory?) use the best,
most

There are ~100 things we are doing we can't explain."

Either they are doing something foolish, which makes no sense,
or they are doing something clever, which is a menace

"Don't stop the horses till we have Prodomate X"
in York count...

Frange

By Frange

People will imagine they have done something for peace, and

8

Daigent

- Baron - ~~700~~ 30 bpt dining?
- CAT - Tiller article
- Tiller: York? Forsberg
- us. test bar: 58?

63?

(Go back to Cuba II -

How did we lose rep?

By refusing CTB!

Check judgment of those who
said: Victory is ours now is
is the next round!